DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 875 EC 003 036

Report on Operations and Results of Special Educational Programs for Educationally Handicapped Minors.
California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento.
Pub Date 67
Note-23p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.25
Descriptors-Academically Handicapped, *Administration, Educational Facilities, Educational Finance, *Educational Needs, *Exceptional Child Research, Financial Support, Inservice Teacher Education, *Learning Disabilities, Legislation, Personnel Needs, Program Evaluation, Program Improvement, Special Classes, *State Programs, State Surveys, Student Transportation, Teacher Education
Identifiers-California

In the school year 1966-67, 283 districts in California (24% of all districts) serving 77% of the state's school children offered special classes for 16,307 educationally handicapped minors, 0.38% of the total school population. Upon a listing of both favorable areas and problems, recommendations were made to provide a current apportionment of state funds for all handicapped programs; initiate a grant program for teacher training in special education; evaluate current provisions of the school housing aid to exceptional children; provide state reimbursement for excess expenses (equitable funding of learning disabilities groups and extraordinary transportation costs); make a study of manpower needs of teaching exceptional children, including assessment of the capabilities and programs of colleges and universities; and extend the services of state and county departments of education to provide coordination and development of inservice training and consultation to teachers and programs for the educationally handicapped. Five appendixes give charts and tables on program growth, enrollment, and sources of teachers. (SN)

ED025875

002167

REPORT ON

OPERATION AND RESULTS OF SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED MINORS

To the Governor of California

and the California Legislature

CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Max Rafferty—Superintendent of Public Instruction
Sacramento 1967

EC 003 036

MAX RAFFERTY
Superintendent of Public Instruction
and Director of Education

EVERETT T. CALVERT
Chief Deputy Superintendent

EUGENE GONZALES
Assistant Superintendent
(807 State Bldg.
Los Angeles 90012)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
721 CAPITOL MALL, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

RONALD W. COX
Associate Superintendent; Chief,
Division of Public School Administration

FRANCIS W. DOYLE
Deputy Superintendent; Chief,
Division of Special Schools and Services

PAUL F. LAWRENCE
Associate Superintendent; Chief,
Division of Higher Education

WILSON C. RILES
Director of Compensatory Education

DONALD E. KITCH
Acting Chief,
Division of Instruction

Honorable Ronald Reagan
Governor
State Capitol
Sacramento. California

Honorable Hugh M. Burns
President pro Tempore
Senate Chambers
State Capitol
Sacramento California

Honorable Jesse M. Unruh
Speaker of the Assembly
State Capitol
Sacramento, California

Dear Sirs:

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 9 of Assembly Bill 464 (Chapter 2165 Statutes of 1963), we are submitting herewith the report on the operation and results of special educational programs for educationally handicapped minors. The report, prepared by the Department of Education is submitted with the approval of the State Board of Education.

Material for the report was obtained through two main sources: (1) questionnaires returned from public school districts and county superintendents of schools offices and (2) information provided the Division of Special Schools and Services via field visits of staff, correspondence, special study institutes and other contacts. The report contains general information concerning the program growth and progress arranged under topical headings. The appendix contains detailed information from districts maintaining special education programs for educationally handicapped minors. A complete summary of the responses to the questionnaires is on file in the Division of Special Schools and Services.

The Department of Education shall be pleased to be of every assistance to the Legislature in its consideration of this report.

Sincerely,

Max Rafferty

MR:DM:rlt

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Report on Operation and Results of Special Educational Programs for Educationally Handicapped Minors

INTRODUCTION

The educationally handicapped minors program was authorized by legislation signed into law in July, 1963, and amended in 1965. These provisions reflected the awareness of the legislature, educators, state and community agencies, parents, and professional groups of the need for extended educational services to children handicapped by learning disorders related to behavioral or neurological handicaps.

There is rarely a simple explanation for the complex behaviors of a pupil with severe learning problems. No one educational approach can effectively deal with all the pupil's specific disabilities, and often a pupil's success may depend upon coordinated educational, psychological and medical services. California's provisions for the educationally handicapped program stress thorough assessment and understanding of each individual pupil's total learning needs and provides a wide range of special educational opportunities for effective instruction. The legislative, professional and community support of this program has made possible the development of a high quality education which continues to receive wide spread recognition, both locally and nationally.

PARTICIPATION

Although the educationally handicapped program is permissive, more than 77% of California's school children attend school in a district that maintains an educationally handicapped program. The majority of these programs may yet be quite limited, but schools are making strong

efforts to establish good programs wherever possible.

Enrollment in the program has shown consistent progress.

School year	Districts	EH Enrollment	% of Total State Enrollment
1963-64	57	2,059	0.09
1964-65	167	6,629	0.18
1965-66	256	10,502	0.30
1966-67 (est.)	283+	16,307	0.38

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND PROGRESS

The educationally handicapped minors program is still new. Each year more school districts enter their first experience in this program. While it is early for detailed results, there is sufficient experience and progress to report definite trends in the development.

FAVORABLE AREAS

1. In the face of many serious problems, school districts in California continue to implement and expand the educationally handicapped program. Districts are striving to provide the best possible program to meet the needs of these pupils. The variety of instructional provisions has enabled pupil placement based on pupil needs and overall district programming.

2. The EH program has afforded opportunities for more appropriate teaching of the pupil with learning problems and has enhanced regular instructional programs as well. Proper resources for helping the handicapped pupil and a growing awareness of the effect of learning problems on many other students are factors frequently mentioned by school personnel as facilitating learning in all classes.

3. There have been a number of pupils who have successfully returned to full-time regular classes to support the view that the educationally

handicapped program is an effective means for reversing failure patterns, prevention of poor school achievement, and reducing possible future drop-outs.

4. The flexibility and safeguards provided by the legislation have been generally well received. Although the flexibility and high standards do create some problems for some districts, there is strong support for this approach. There appears to be a relationship between the effort made by the district to meet or exceed these standards and the success of its program. It must be pointed out, however, that all districts do not have equal resources for maintaining this program at the present time.

5. The absence of a special credential requirement has allowed districts to select their best qualified staff members and greatly facilitated the initiation of programs. Specialized consultation has been an outstanding feature in providing teachers with much needed assistance. The effects of good in-service programs are very much in evidence in EH classrooms throughout the state.

PROBLEM AREAS

1. The demand for well-trained personnel has far exceeded any possible immediate resources. The strength and expansion of the EH program will depend primarily upon solutions to staffing problems.

a. Teachers.

- The growth of the program has far exceeded the availability of trained teachers in the state.
- The resources for prividing critically needed training for the present teachers in the EH program are highly inadequate.

- The few well-developed training programs now offered by California's colleges are providing only a meager number of teachers in respect to the need, and some programs are designed solely to train research personnel or college instructors in this field.
- The EH program has attracted the more successful teachers. The largest single reason for teacher turnover was due to EH teachers receiving more responsible positions (i.e.: psychologists, supervisors, administrators). Thus while filling necessary staff positions, many good teachers are leaving the EH classrooms for professional promotions.

b. <u>District staff</u>

- The EH program has made heavy demands of district personnel. Psychologists, psychometrists, consultants, supervisors, and administrators have encountered excessive work loads to support the educationally handicapped program in addition to the state mandated programs, federal programs, and other regular duties for the district. Demands for more diagnostic and psychological services are being made in other areas as well as the EH program.
- Additional staff with adequate training in special education are in extreme short supply and have been a strong factor limiting the expansion of good programs.
- College training programs are not supplying necessary replacement personnel, and therefore personnel needed for growth are in critical shortage.

- Teachers are often unable to obtain necessary guidance and assistance since districts frequently lack staff who are well trained in this area and other local resources are lacking.

2. The needed classrooms and equipment are difficult to obtain and restrict program growth as well as affecting the quality of the program.

- Equipment for the EH program is critical. Because of high costs, classes are frequently begun without needed equipment and materials. The acquiring of this equipment over a period of years imposes severe limitations on teacher effectiveness, pupil progress, and keeping good teachers in the program.
- Classroom space is another major problem. State School Housing Aid for Exceptional Children support has been of much help, but is not yet adequate. Re-evaluation of this support is necessary. While some non-state-aided districts have been able to provide or build adequate classrooms, others have a severe shortage of classroom space and for a number of reasons have not been able to provide classrooms for the educationally handicapped.
- The program of learning disability groups is gaining wide-spread district support. Because of the type of specialized program and equipment necessary, space and equipment needs often limit the desired growth of this part of the program. State School Housing Aid could be of much value for this program, if authorized.

3. Transportation is an individual district problem, but one affecting a large number of districts with EH programs.

- Transportation costs are high and when added to the program

expense, far exceed the reimbursable excess cost limit, therefore are local district expenses. This is a serious problem in many rural and mountain counties and districts.

- The nature of many EH pupils requires separate transportation facilities, adding to the cost.
- The need for transportation is in inverse ratio to size of the EH program. Larger programs are more easily accessible than a few classes in a district. Since many districts have only a limited number of classes, transportation remains a critical factor.
- There are great differences between districts in transportation problems, depending on density of population, size of area, local transportation services, etc.

4. The current level of State financial assistance has been a factor reducing the initiation, expansion, or effectiveness of many programs. In some districts, special class programs have been more adequately supported with the additional financial assistance authorized in 1965. Several problems are still critical, however.

- Because of the many factors necessary to implement or expand the program, <u>current year funding</u> would be a major improvement. Such expenses include (1) personnel and time required to accomplish identification, program planning, placement, and program coordination, (2) necessary equipment and materials, (3) and the normal added expense of teacher salaries, small class size, curriculum requirements, etc.
- Because the type of program conducted under <u>learning disability group</u> provisions is not related to class units, the a.d.a. accounting does not represent either the number of pupils, extent of effort, or amount of instruction given. Since

many districts cannot accrue a.d.a. in a reasonable manner, costs of the learning disability program appear much higher than other programs. Districts usually receive less than half of their excess costs in state support. As this program has a great potential, careful attention needs to be given both the method of accounting and adequate state support of the LDG program. Most districts cannot continue this program as long as state financial support remains substantially lower than special classes.

- Because of the necessity to equip each unit of a program more adequately at the outset, financial assistance for initial capital outlay is needed.
- Some adjustments are still occurring in actual costs of all parts of the EH program. Continued analysis needs to be given the levels of excess cost reimbursements to insure adequate support levels.

5. As no immediate solutions are anticipated for personnel and professional training problems, there is much district concern for county superintendents of schools and the State Department of Education to provide coordinated and expanded programs of consultation, curriculum development, in-service training, and pupil personnel services.

6. The problem of children with multiple handicaps continues to be of concern, even though it is more of a problem to some districts than others. Since some pupils are still without adequate programs, a need remains to develop provisions to better serve the pupil with multiple handicaps.

7. As the educationally handicapped and educable mentally retarded

programs grow more successful, there becomes an obvious need for better school district programs for slow learning pupils. Careful study of this problem is needed to improve school curriculum in this area and to discourage an ever increasing demand for more "special" educational programs for pupils whose needs might reasonably be expected to be met within a comprehensive regular school program.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The educationally handicapped program has maintained its early interest and progress among community leaders, school authorities, and parents. It has gained much recognition and support throughout the state and nation.

The successes have been substantial not only in school behavior and achievement, but in other aspects as well. While these benefits have not come easily nor been total solutions, they frequently exceed expectations.

The problems are largely those of a new program; establishing the experience and support for a program of this scope. Many problems appear to be capable of solution, yet a few seem to loom as major obstacles to desired development. California's need for trained and capable teachers and staff personnel is one of these major obstacles.

The following recommendations are submitted for consideration:

(1) Beginning with the 1967-68 school year, provide for a current apportionment of state funds for all handicapped minors programs, including the educationally handicapped.

(2) Authorize a grant program for the training of teachers of educationally handicapped minors and appropriate funds for its implementation for the regular terms and summer sessions at the earliest possible date.

(3) Evaluate the current provisions of the School Housing Aid for Exceptional Children as relates to the Educationally Handicapped Minors Program to:

  (a) determine the adequate footage allocations necessary for special classes,

  (b) extend provisions for allocations to learning disability groups.

(4) Authorize state reimbursement for excess expense incurred in educating EH minors at levels determined necessary by the Department, including equitable funding of learning disability groups and support of extraordinary transportation costs.

(5) Conduct a detailed study of the manpower needs in all areas of teaching of exceptional children, the capabilities and programs of the colleges and universities, and authorize a program to assist the state in providing trained and effective teachers for handicapped pupils in the public schools.

(6) Authorize the State Department of Education and the County Superintendents of Schools to expand their services to provide coordination and development of in-service training and consultation to districts and teachers in the EH program.

APPENDIX A

GROWTH OF THE EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED PROGRAM IN CALIFORNIA 1963 - 1966

	OCTOBER 1964	OCTOBER 1965	OCTOBER 1966
Number of school districts in the State (K-12)	1,491	1,357	1,181
Number of districts approved for EH programs	187	286	342
Percent of districts approved	12.5	21.1	29.0
Number of districts with EH program enrollments	132	198	283
Percent of districts with EH program	8.9	14.6	24.0
Total State enrollment (K-12 plus special)	4,089,343	4,201,129	4,357,634
Total district enrollment in districts with EH programs	1,806,573	2,208,300	3,374,099
Percent of State enrollment in districts with EH programs	44.2	52.6	77.4
Total EH enrollments	3,470	7,590	12,975
Percent of district enrollment in EH programs	0.19	0.34	0.38
Percent of State enrollment in EH programs	0.09	0.18	0.30
EH enrollments in spec. classes	2,225	5,039	8,109
Percent in special class	64.1	66.4	62.5
EH enrollments in LDG	1,019	2,185	4,514
Percent in LDG	29.4	28.8	34.8
EH enrollments in Home Inst.	226	366	352
Percent in Home Instruction	6.5	4.8	2.7
Percent boys enrolled	----	----	82.4
Percent EH Special Class pupils transported by district	34.0	----	34.3
Total teachers in EH program	515	----	1,333

Percent enrolled by grade level - October 1966

K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
.01	4.4	8.5	12.5	14.1	14.1	12.6	10.2	10.0	6.3	3.8	2.2	1.1

Data from District responses to Department of Education Surveys.

APPENDIX B

EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED ENROLLMENTS SUMMARY[1]
(end of first school month, October 1966)

Item	Elem. Dist.	Unified Jt. Adm.	High Dist.	County Schools	Total
State Enroll.					4,357,634
Districts in State	821	228	132		1,181
Districts W/Program	131	117	22	14	283
% Dist. W/Program	16.0	51.3	16.7		24.0
District Enroll.	691,642	2,494,980	182,856	4,621	3,374,099
					77.0
EH Enrollment	4,325	7,860	297	493	12,975
% of State Enroll.	0.62	0.31	0.16		0.38
Spec. Class Enroll.	2,532	5,196	205	176	8,109
% of EH Enroll.	58.5	66.1	69.0	35.7	62.5
LDG Enrollment	1,721	2,393	91	309	4,514
	39.8	30.5	30.6	62.7	34.8
H & H Enroll.	72	271	1	8	352
	1.7	3.4	0.4	1.6	2.7
Boys Enroll.	3,579	6,506	221	379	10,685
% of EH Enroll.	82.7	82.8	74.4	76.9	82.4
Girls Enroll.	746	1,354	76	114	2,290
	17.3	17.2	26.6	23.1	17.6

[1] Based on 94% return of Department of Education questionnaire.

APPENDIX C

EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED ENROLLMENTS

BY GRADE LEVEL, OCTOBER 1966

Item	Elem. Dist.	Unified Jt. Adm.	High Dist.	County Schools	Total
Grade K	30	23	----	4	57
% of Total	0.7	0.3		.8	.01
1	253	293	----	24	570
	5.9	3.7		4.9	4.4
2	491	583	----	25	1,099
	11.4	7.4		5.1	8.5
3	655	929	----	34	1,618
	15.1	11.8		6.9	12.5
4	752	1,042	---	41	1,835
	17.4	13.3		8.3	14.1
5	742	1,064	----	20	1,826
	17.2	13.5		4.1	14.1
6	633	995	----	10	1,638
	14.6	12.7		2.0	12.6
7	376	906	22	21	1,325
	8.7	11.3	7.4	4.3	10.2
8	386	845	18	50	1,299
	8.9	11.0	6.1	10.1	10.0
9	7	539	105	162	813
	0.2	6.9	35.4	32.9	6.3
10	----	315	71	77	463
		4.0	23.9	15.6	3.8
11	----	214	52	19	285
		2.7	17.5	3.9	2.2
12	----	112	29	6	147
		1.4	9.8	1.2	1.1

[1]Based on 94% return of Department of Education questionnaire.

APPENDIX D

ENROLLMENTS IN THE EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED PROGRAM

	October 1964	October 1965	October 1966
	SC-LD-HH	SC-LD-HH	SC- LD-HH
ALAMEDA COUNTY			
Alameda City Unified	0- 0-14	9- 0-19	9- 0-18
Albany City Unified	0	0	0
Berkeley City Unified	16-66-10	34-63- 6	27-119- 9
Castro Valley Unified	9- 0- 0	X	19- 0- 0
Emery Unified	----	----	3- 0- 0
Fremont Unified	4- 4- 0	201-19-16	32- 15- 0
Hayward Unified	20- 0- 4	31- 0- 1	30- 0- 2
Livermore Unified	5- 0- 0	31- 0- 0	36- 0- 0
Murray Elementary	----	X	10- 0- 0
Oakland City Unified	39-13-26	38-30-13	51- 52-20
Piedmont City Unified	22- 0- 0	22-18- 1	22- 22- 0
Pleasanton Elem.	----	----	9- 0- 0
San Leandro Unified	17- 0- 5	18- 0- 4	29- 0- 3
San Lorenzo Unified	0- 0- 4	18- 0- 2	33- 0- 1
BUTTE COUNTY			
Butte Co. Schools	0	0	0
Chico Unified	----	4- 0- 0	6- 0- 4
Durham Unified	----	----	0- 0- 1
Oroville City Elem.	0	X	0
Palermo Union Elem.	X	8- 3- 1	7- 0- 0
Paradise Unified	----	----	0
Thermalito Union Elem.	0- 0- 2	X	0- 8- 0
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY			
Acalanes Union High	0-15- 0	0-15- 0	0- 32- 0
Antioch Unified	----	0-60- 0	0- 38-12
Brentwood Union Elem.	0	X	0
Byron Union Elem.	0- 5- 0	0- 6- 0	0
John Swett Unified	----	X	12- 0- 0
Knightsen Elem.	0- 3- 0	X	11- 48- 0
Lafayette Elem.	31- 0- 0	38- 0- 0	45- 31- 0
Liberty Union High	----	0	0- 17- 0
Martinez Unified	0-24- 2	21-34- 5	28- 16-19
Moraga Elem.	----	----	X
Mt. Diablo Unified	74-39-6	X	254- 93- 2
Orinda Union Elem.	15- 9- 0	28- 6- 2	52- 12- 0
Pittsburg Unified	0- 0- 2	X	3- 0- 5
Richmond Unified	12-41- 5	X	53-165-26
Walnut Creek Elem.	0- 7- 0	0-16-11	7- 20- 3
DEL NORTE COUNTY			
Del Norte Co. Unified	----	X	0- 93- 0
EL DORADO COUNTY			
Camino Union Elem.	----	X	7- 0- 0
El Dorado Union High	----	----	0- 17- 0
Lake Tahoe Unified	0	27- 0- 0	22- 0- 2
Placerville Union Elem.	----	----	11- 0- 0

KEY

- SC Special Classes as provided for in Education Code Section 6751a
- LD Learning Disability Groups as provided for in Education Code Section 6751b
- HH Home and Hospital Instruction as provided for in Education Code Section 6751d
- 0 No enrollment in program as of date indicated
- X No response to questionnaire
- ---- Not authorized as of date indicated

APPENDIX D--Continued

ENROLLMENTS IN THE EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED PROGRAM

FRESNO COUNTY			
Fresno Co. Schools	---	---	---
Fowler Unified	---	9- 0- 1	0- 9- 0
Fresno City Unified	---	X	18- 0- 2
Sanger Unified	---	---	---
HUMBOLDT COUNTY			
Arcata Elem.	---	---	0- 0- 1
Arcata Union High	---	---	0
Eureka City Elem & High	---	0- 0- 5	0- 0-11
Freshwater Elem.	---	---	X
IMPERIAL COUNTY			
El Centro Elem.	---	---	9- 0- 0
Holtville Unified	---	---	5- 0- 0
Seeley Union Elem.	---	---	3- 0- 0
INYO COUNTY			
Bishop Union Elem.	0- 2- 0	0- 28- 0	0- 15- 0
Lone Pine Unified	---	---	8- 0- 0
KERN COUNTY			
Kern Co. Schools	---	9- 0- 0	11- 0- 0
Bakersfield City Elem.	11- 0- 0	33- 0- 0	42- 0- 0
China Lake Jt. Elem.	---	6- 0- 0	13- 0- 0
Indian Wells Val. Jt. Elem.	---	11- 0- 0	11- 0- 0
Taft City Elem.	---	0- 17- 0	0- 17- 1
KINGS COUNTY			
Kings Co. Schools	0	0- 0- 0	8- 0- 0
LASSEN COUNTY			
Lassen Co. Schools	---	0- 0- 0	0
LOS ANGELES COUNTY			
L. A. Co. Schools	0	X	34- 0- 0
ABC Unified	---	0	9- 0- 0
Alhambra Elem & High	0	37- 28- 1	44- 34- 0
Arcadia Unified	0- 0- 6	0- 18- 2	6- 24- 2
Azusa Unified	18- 0- 0	16- 0- 0	20- 0- 1
Baldwin Park Unified	0	12- 0- 1	17- 0- 2
Bassett Unified	---	16- 4- 1	29- 0- 0
Bellflower Unified	32- 0- 7	39- 31- 6	41-117- 7
Beverly Hills Unified	---	0	7- 0- 1
Bonita Unified	---	0	9- 0- 0
Burbank Unified	---	0	28- 0- 0
Castaic Union Elem.	---	---	0
Centinela Val. Union High	0-90- 0	0-123- 0	0-118- 0
Charter Oak Unified	---	0	24- 0- 1
Claremont Unified	7- 0- 0	0	15- 80- 0
Compton City Elem.	---	---	22- 0- 0
Compton Union High	11- 0- 0	0	0
Covina Valley Unified	24- 0- 0	38- 0- 1	45- 0- 2
Culver City Unified	---	22- 0- 0	87- 0- 0
Downey Unified	---	10- 0- 0	50- 0- 1
Duarte Unified	0- 3- 0	0- 10- 3	9- 14- 2
E. Whittier City Elem.	25- 0- 1	32- 27- 4	18- 42- 1
El Monte Elem.	5- 0- 0	14- 0- 0	18- 0- 2

APPENDIX D--Continued

ENROLLMENTS IN THE EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED PROGRAM

LOS ANGELES COUNTY			
El Rancho Unified	0	2- 5- 0	18- 35- 0
El Segundo Unified	0-10- 0	11- 8- 0	27- 0- 0
Enterprise City Elem.	8- 0- 0	8- 0- 0	12- 0- 0
Garvey Elem.	11- 0- 2	21- 0- 0	33- 0- 0
Glendale Unified	12- 0- 1	35- 0- 0	41- 0- 0
Glendora Unified	41- 0- 2	40- 0- 3	58- 0- 2
Hawthorne Elem.	7- 0- 0	15- 0- 0	21- 0- 0
Hermosa Beach Elem.	14- 0- 0	15-18- 0	32- 16- 0
Hudson Elem.	31- 0- 0	44- 0- 4	63- 0-12
Inglewood Unified	6- 0- 1	11- 0- 4	31- 0- 0
Keppel Union Elem.	8- 0- 0	19- 0- 0	20- 0- 0
La Canada Unified	9- 0- 1	12- 0- 0	8- 4- 0
Lancaster Elem.	0	X	0
Las Virgenes Unified	---	---	8- 0- 0
Lawndale Elem.	7- 0- 1	20- 0- 0	22- 0- 0
Lennox Elem.	9- 0- 0	0	0
Little Lake City Elem.	19- 0- 0	29- 0- 0	33- 26- 0
Long Beach Unified	131-51- 0	183-74- 0	232- 81- 5
Los Angeles Unified	33- 0- 0	85- 0- 0	161- 13- 0
Los Nietos Elem.	0- 8- 0	8- 0- 0	10- 17- 0
Lowell Joint Elem.	22-22- 0	X	40- 69- 0
Lynwood Unified	---	X	17- 0- 1
Manhattan Beach Elem.	0	20- 0- 0	52- 0- 5
Monrovia Unified	20- 0- 0	33- 0- 0	30- 0- 1
Montebello Unified	6- 0- 0	8- 0- 0	18- 0- 0
Mountain View Elem.	0	0	0- 4- 0
Newhall Elem.	---	---	0
Norwalk-La Mirada Unified	8- 0- 7	36- 0- 8	52- 0-10
Palos Verdes Penin. Unified	19- 0- 0	36- 0- 1	77- 10- 0
Pasadena City Unified	20- 0-10	26- 0- 0	39- 0- 4
Pomona Unified	---	---	55- 0- 1
Redondo Beach City Elem.	25- 0- 0	37- 8- 4	47-118- 4
Rosemead Elem.	0	23- 0- 5	6- 0- 1
Rowland Elem.	15- 0- 0	22- 0- 2	46- 0- 1
San Gabriel Elem.	10- 0- 0	7- 0- 0	27- 0- 2
San Marino Unified	---	---	9- 13- 0
Santa Monica Unified	6- 0- 1	20- 0- 5	70- 0- 0
Saugus Union Elem.	---	---	8- 0- 0
So. Bay Union High	---	---	44- 0- 1
So. Pasadena Unified	---	---	5- 0- 1
So. Whittier Elem.	0	3- 0- 0	0
Sulpher Springs Union Elem.	---	3- 0- 0	13- 0- 0
Temple City Unified	---	---	9- 0- 0
Torrance Unified	41-72- 4	220-91- 1	247- 48- 0
Valle Lindo Elem.	0	0-12- 0	X
Walnut Elem.	---	---	2- 0- 0
West Covina Unified	7- 0- 0	17- 0- 0	26- 47- 0
Westside Union Elem	---	---	5- 0- 0
Whittier City Elem.	0- 0- 1	20- 0- 2	31- 0- 2
Wiseburn Elem.	4- 0- 0	7- 0- 0	11- 0- 0

APPENDIX D--Continued

ENROLLMENTS IN THE EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED PROGRAM

MADERA COUNTY			
Madera Co. Schools	0	0	X
Chowchilla Elem.	---	---	0- 3- 0
Madera Unified	---	12- 6- 0	0- 20- 0
No. Fork Union Elem.	---	X	0- 6- 0
MARIN COUNTY			
Marin Co. Schools	0	16- 0- 0	27- 0- 0
Dixie Elem.	0-13- 0	0-45- 0	0- 43- 1
Fairfax Elem.	---	---	X
Kentfield Elem.	---	---	X
Larkspur Elem.	---	---	0
Mill Valley Elem.	0	0- 4- 0	8- 7- 0
Novato City Unified	0- 2- 0	0-18- 0	0- 44- 2
Reed Union Elem.	0-20- 0	0-29- 0	0- 34- 0
Ross Elem.	---	---	---
San Anselmo Elem.	---	0-60- 0	0- 30- 0
San Rafael Elem. & High	0- 3- 1	0-56- 1	3- 79- 5
Sausalito Elem.	---	---	0- 11- 1
Tamalpais Union High	---	---	0- 16- 0
MERCED COUNTY			
Hilmar Unified	0	0	0- 18- 0
Livingston Union Elem.	---	7- 0- 0	7- 0- 0
MONTEREY COUNTY			
Alisal Union Elem.	---	0	0- 0- 1
Carmel Unified	---	1-56- 3	0
Monterey Penin. Unified	0- 0-12	8- 0-12	41- 0- 0
Salinas City Elem.	---	0	9- 0- 0
Salinas Union High	---	---	13- 0- 0
NAPA COUNTY			
Napa Co. Schools	---	X	X
Napa Valley Unified	---	6- 0- 1	0- 40- 3
Shurtleff Elem.	11- 0- 0	X	X
NEVEDA COUNTY			
Ready Springs Union Elem.	---	11- 0- 0	11- 0- 0
ORANGE COUNTY			
Anaheim City Elem.	---	---	6-179- 0
Anaheim Union High	---	---	7- 23- 1
Buena Park Elem.	9- 0- 0	20- 0- 0	22- 0- 1
Capistrano Unified	---	0- 0- 2	9- 0- 0
Centralia Elem.	8- 0- 0	44- 0- 0	61- 82- 1
Cypress Elem.	5- 0- 0	22- 0- 0	40- 0- 1
Fountain Val. Elem.	---	0-21- 0	0- 39- 0
Fullerton Elem.	0	21- 0- 0	33- 0- 0
Garden Grove Unified	45-30- 0	117-30- 0	165- 32- 4
Laguna Beach Unified	---	0- 0- 1	0
La Habra Elem.	---	X	22- 0- 0
Los Alamitos Elem.	---	---	19- 0- 0
Magnolia Elem.	---	---	12- 0- 0
Newport-Mesa Unified	---	33- 0- 0	117- 0- 0
Ocean View Elem.	X	10- 1- 0	19- 0- 0
Orange Unified	0	20- 0- 0	62- 0- 1

APPENDIX D--Continued

ENROLLMENTS IN THE EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED PROGRAM

ORANGE COUNTY			
Placentia Unified	---	11- 4- 1	19- 0- 0
Tustin Elem.	---	---	13- 0- 0
Westminster Elem.	---	6- 0- 0	16- 0- 0
PLACER COUNTY			
Roseville City Elem.	0	0	4- 1- 0
PLUMAS COUNTY			
Plumas Unified	---	---	0
RIVERSIDE COUNTY			
Alvord Unified	23- 8- 1	X	51- 27- 0
Corona Unified	---	---	21- 0- 0
Hemet Unified	---	X	56- 0- 0
Palm Springs Unified	---	15- 7- 2	64- 6- 0
Perris Elem.	---	---	0
Perris Union High	---	16- 0- 0	0
SACRAMENTO COUNTY			
Sacramento Co. Schools	---	---	6- 0- 0
Folsom-Cordova Jt. Unified	---	---	8- 0- 1
Grant Jt. Union High	---	0- 0- 3	0- 0- 1
Rio Linda Union Elem.	0-33- 0	12- 52- 0	32- 56- 0
Sacramento City Unified	22- 0- 2	33- 11- 3	61- 21- 1
San Juan Unified	11- 0- 0	53- 26- 0	52- 0-15
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY			
Barstow Unified	---	X	0
Chino Unified	0	X	30- 0- 0
Colton Jt. Unified	0	0- 38- 1	11- 32- 1
Fontana Unified	---	---	22- 0- 0
Hesperia Elem.	---	6- 0- 0	8- 0- 0
Morongo Unified	---	0- 3- 0	0
Ontario-Montclair Elem.	---	11- 0- 0	22- 0- 0
Redlands Unified	4- 0- 0	X	95- 28- 3
Rialto Unified	18-48- 0	62- 76- 2	81-115- 0
San Bernardino Unified	46- 0- 0	89- 0- 0	118- 0- 0
Upland Elem.	---	---	10- 0- 0
Victor Elem.	---	---	4- 0- 0
Yucaipa Joint Unified	---	---	10- 11- 0
SAN DIEGO COUNTY			
Cajon Valley Union Elem.	---	0- 12- 0	0- 85- 0
Cardiff Elem.	0	2- 0- 1	0
Carlsbad Union Elem.	0	44- 0- 1	43- 0- 1
Chula Vista Elem.	7- 0- 0	22- 0- 0	30- 0- 1
Coronado Unified	0	X	0
Escondido Union Elem.	---	---	9- 0- 0
Grossmont Union High	0	0	34- 13- 6
Lakeside Union Elem.	22- 0- 0	21- 0- 0	22- 0- 1
La Mesa-Spring Val. Elem.	14-52- 0	41-123- 1	90- 96- 3
Lemon Grove Elem.	---	0	22- 0- 0
National Elem.	19-21- 1	22- 5- 0	33- 58- 0
Oceanside-Carlsbad Union High	10- 0- 0	9- 0- 0	6- 0- 0
Oceanside Union Elem.	---	---	19- 18- 0
Poway Unified	---	5- 0- 0	6- 0- 0
San Diego City Unified	537- 0-11	816- 16-15	959- 41- 3

APPENDIX D--Continued

ENROLLMENTS IN THE EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED PROGRAM

SAN DIEGO COUNTY			
Santee Elem.	0	0- 0- 5	0
Solano Beach Elem.	5- 0- 0	X	0
So. Bay Union Elem.	9- 0- 0	9- 0- 0	22- 0- 0
Sweetwater Union High	---	---	29-102- 0
Vista Unified	---	0	0- 0- 1
SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY			
San Francisco Unified	75-30-40	329-127-74	220-153-24
SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY			
San Joaquin Co. Schools	4- 4- 4	25- 0-17	13- 11- 0
Dent Union Elem.	9- 0- 0	9- 0- 0	9- 0- 0
Lincoln Unified	0	38- 0- 0	39- 0- 0
Lodi Elem.	---	9- 0- 1	22- 0- 2
Stockton City Unified	5- 0- 4	25- 2- 0	0- 13- 7
Van Allen Elem.	---	1- 0- 1	X
SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY			
San Luis Obispo Co. Sc.	11- 0- 0	17- 0- 0	7- 0- 0
Atascadero Unified	0-49- 4	0- 53- 0	0- 21- 4
Lucia Mar Unified	11- 0- 0	24- 0- 0	17- 7- 0
Paso Robles Union Elem.	---	0	8- 0- 0
San Luis Coastal Unified	---	10- 0- 0	12- 0- 0
SAN MATEO COUNTY			
San Mateo Co. Schools	0	0	0
Belmont Elem.	6- 0- 0	11- 0- 0	20- 0- 0
Brisbane Elem.	0- 5- 0	9- 13- 1	8- 0- 0
Burlingame Elem.	8- 0- 0	11- 7- 0	15- 13- 0
Cabrillo Unified	---	5- 0- 0	8- 12- 0
Jefferson Elem.	0	X	16- 7- 0
Jefferson Union High	---	---	12- 0- 0
Laguna Salada Union Elem.	0	6- 9- 4	24- 22- 2
Las Lomitas Elem.	0- 0- 2	0- 0- 3	0- 13- 2
Menlo Park City Elem.	0	1- 20- 2	0- 41- 0
Millbrae Elem.	---	8- 0- 1	8- 0- 0
Portola Val. Elem.	0	X	0
Ravenswood City Elem.	0	X	28- 2- 1
Redwood City Elem.	8- 0- 1	8- 0- 1	20- 0- 0
San Bruno Park Elem.	---	9- 0- 0	17- 17- 1
San Carlos Elem.	---	20- 0- 0	18- 0- 0
San Mateo City Elem.	17- 0- 2	41- 0- 5	56- 21- 1
San Mateo Union High	---	---	0- 9- 0
Sequoia Union High	12- 0- 0	12- 0- 0	11- 0- 0
So. San Francisco Unified	6- 0- 0	10- 6- 0	11- 13- 0
SANTA BARBARA COUNTY			
Goleta Union Elem.	7- 2- 2	27- 17- 7	42- 66- 0
Guadalupe Jt. Union Elem.	---	0	0
Hope Elem.	---	7- 0- 0	16- 0- 0
Lompoc Unified	8- 0- 0	14- 0- 0	16- 0- 0
Orcutt Union Elem.	---	10- 0- 0	21- 23- 0
Santa Barbara Elem & High	29-54- 4	30- 84- 7	18-138- 7
Santa Maria City Elem.	22-33- 0	32- 44- 0	19- 37- 2
SANTA CLARA COUNTY			
Alum Rock Union Elem.	8- 5- 4	18- 0- 5	48- 3- 1
Cambrian Elem.	---	---	22-151- 0

APPENDIX D--Continued

ENROLLMENTS IN THE EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED PROGRAM

SANTA CLARA COUNTY			
Campbell Union Elem.	---	18- 0- 1	26- 3- 1
Campbell Union High	---	---	---
Cupertino Union Elem.	18-64- 0	105-22- 7	159- 35- 0
Los Altos Elem.	---	22- 8- 6	27- 0- 0
Los Gatos Jt. Union High	---	---	9- 0- 0
Los Gatos Union Elem.	0- 0- 1	X	38- 30- 4
Milpitas Elem.	---	---	0
Moreland Elem.	9- 0- 0	21- 0- 0	49- 0- 0
Morgan Hill Unified	---	---	8- 0- 0
Oak Grove Elem.	---	---	8- 0- 0
Palo Alto City Unified	8-39- 0	138-90- 2	65-209- 0
Santa Clara Unified	---	11- 0- 0	41- 9- 1
San Jose City Unified	7- 0- 0	20-25- 4	18- 53- 7
Saratoga Union Elem.	---	---	0- 3- 0
Sunnyvale Elem.	0- 0- 1	13-29- 0	30- 35- 4
Union Elem.	10- 0- 1	21- 0- 0	33- 28- 2
Whisman Elem.	19- 0- 0	18- 0- 0	33- 0- 0
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY			
Santa Cruz Co. Schools	---	5- 0- 0	7- 0- 0
Live Oak Elem.	11- 0- 0	17- 0- 0	31- 5- 0
Pajaro Valley Unified	11- 0- 0	9- 0- 3	31- 0- 1
Santa Cruz City Schools	0- 0- 2	0- 0- 2	0- 18- 1
Scotts Val. Union Elem.	---	0-13- 0	7- 0- 0
SHASTA COUNTY			
Shasta Co. Schools	0	7- 0- 0	7- 0- 0
Enterprise Elem.	8- 0- 0	8- 0- 0	4- 0- 0
Redding Elem.	---	43- 9- 2	16- 0- 0
Shasta Lake Union Elem.	8- 0- 0	X	8- 0- 0
Shasta Union High	---	4- 0- 0	10- 0- 0
SISKIYOU COUNTY			
Etna Union Elem.	---	---	9- 0- 0
Etna Union High	---	X	X
Yreka Union High	9- 0- 0	X	16- 0- 0
SOLANO COUNTY			
Solano Co. Schools	---	0	0
Armijo Jt. Union High	---	---	---
Benicia Unified	---	0- 0- 2	X
Fairfield Elem.	---	0-11- 1	0
Travis Unified	---	---	X
Vallejo City Unified	0	9- 0- 0	15- 0- 2
SONOMA COUNTY			
Sonoma Co. Schools	---	---	9- 0- 0
Bellevue Union Elem.	---	6- 0- 2	X
Cotati Elem.	---	0	11- 1- 0
Healdsburg Union Elem.	---	---	4- 0- 0
Healdsburg Union High	---	---	6- 0- 0
Mark West Union Elem.	---	---	9- 0- 0
Roseland Elem.	---	---	0
Santa Rosa City High	---	11- 0- 0	8- 0- 0
Sonoma Valley Unified	---	---	12- 0- 1

APPENDIX D--Continued

ENROLLMENTS IN THE EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED PROGRAM

STANISLAUS COUNTY			
Ceres Unified	7- 0- 0	5- 0- 0	1- 0- 1
Hughson Union Elem.	0	0- 8- 1	5- 0- 0
Modesto City Elem & High	0	5- 0- 1	14- 0- 1
Patterson Joint Unified	5- 0- 0	6- 0- 1	9- 0- 0
SUTTER COUNTY			
Sutter Co. Schools	X	0- 6- 0	X
Yuba City Unified	----	----	0
TEHAMA COUNTY			
Tehama Co. Schools	0	5- 0- 0	6- 0- 0
Antelope Elem.	----	0- 1- 0	0- 6- 0
Los Molinos Unified	----	1- 0- 0	0
TULARE COUNTY			
Tulare Co. Schools	1- 2- 1	18-19- 0	30-26- 0
Cutler-Orosi Jt. Unified	----	0	X
Porterville City Elem.	----	9- 0- 0	5- 0- 0
Tulare Union High	----	----	0
Visalia Unified	22- 0- 0	22- 0- 0	X
TUOLUMNE COUNTY			
Tuolumne Co. Schools	9- 0- 0	X	11- 0- 0
VENTURA COUNTY			
Hueneme Elem.	0-19- 0	0-26- 0	0-28- 0
Ojai Unified	----	30-11- 0	55- 4- 0
Oxnard Elem.	27- 0- 0	29- 0- 2	39- 0- 1
Oxnard Union High	----	----	0-16- 0
Santa Paula Elem.	----	0- 8- 0	27- 0- 0
Santa Paula Union High	----	----	0
Simi Valley Unified	----	----	7- 0- 0
Timber Elem.	----	X	20- 0- 0
Ventura Unified	21- 0- 0	30- 0- 0	115- 6- 0
YOLO COUNTY			
Davis Joint Unified	8- 0- 0	8-35- 1	17-50- 1
Washington Unified	----	----	0-31- 0
Woodland Joint Unified	----	----	7- 0- 0
YUBA COUNTY			
Yuba Co. Schools	----	----	X
SC	2225	5039	8109
LDG	1019	2185	4514
HH	229	366	352
Total	3470	7590	12975

APPENDIX E

SOURCES OF TEACHERS FOR THE EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED PROGRAM

As of End of First School Month
October 1966

Districts Responding - 149

	Total Number	Postponement or Partial Fulfill	Full Credential	Hold EMR Credential	Hold PH Credential	Hold Pupil Personnel	No EH Preparation	Some EH Preparation	Over 18 Hrs. EH Prep
OBTAINED WITHIN THE DISTRICT									
From regular classes of district	781	14	546	16	2	38	155	380	87
From EMR or TMR classes of dist.	58	2	32	39	2	1	3	37	11
From PH classes of district	10	0	8	0	8	0	0	1	3
From substitutes or hourly staff	122	6	82	2	0	0	17	67	4
From other	56	1	47	1	0	2	10	27	15
Sub Total	1,027								
OBTAINED FROM OTHER DISTRICTS									
From reg. classes of other dist.	127	6	99	5	0	4	36	42	9
From EMR or TMR classes other dist.	21	1	16	7	1	0	2	7	3
From PH classes of other district	6	0	4	0	3	0	1	1	1
From Other	47	2	30	2	1	3	3	12	17
Sub Total	201								
OBTAINED FROM OTHER SOURCES									
From college or teacher training	57	11	38	3	0	0	5	24	12
From private schools, clinics,etc.	19	2	16	1	0	0	1	8	5
From home (housewife, etc.)	17	1	16	1	1	0	3	12	1
From non-educational employment	5	1	4	0	0	0	3	0	0
From other	7	1	5	0	0	0	2	5	0
Sub Total	105								
District Totals	1,333	48	943	77	18	48	241	623	168
Percentages		4	71	6	1	4	18	47	13

How many EH teachers were obtained from out-of-state? 56

Do you pay additional amounts for EH teachers? Yes 52 No 218

Of last year's EH teachers, what percentage had to be replaced?

Percent Turnover	No. of Districts	% of Districts	
0%	93	44%	
1 - 20%	22	10%	
21 - 40%	30	14%	Number of
41 - 60%	28	13%	Teachers
61 - 80%	5	3%	Replaced
81 -100%	34	16%	205

Of last year's EH teachers replaced, how many were:

	No.	Percent
"Normal" turnover	98	48
Related to EH program	67	33
No response to this item	40	19